



REDMOND PARK BOARD



Meeting Minutes June 1, 2006 Redmond Senior Center

I. Call to order/Welcome to Citizen Guests

The regular meeting of the Redmond Park Board was called to order by Park Board Chairperson Lori Snodgrass at 7:02 p.m.

Park Board members present: Chairperson Snodgrass; Co-chair: Kelsey; Board members: Ladd, Dige, Bourguignon, Margeson, Stewart and Youth Advocate Thomas.

Absent and Excused: Youth Advocate Duncanson

City staff present: Craig Larsen, Parks Director; Tim Cox, Parks Planning Manager; Greg Byszeski, Park Operations Manager, Steve Gibbs, Public Works Engineer, and Sharon Sato, Recording Secretary.

Consultants: Don Campbell, Bruce Dees & Associates and Wayne Ivary, Ivary and Associates.

Audience: 3 – John Mowery, Peter Kolloen, and Gizela Berreth, Redmond residents.

II. Approval of Minutes

The following corrections were recommended to the May 4, 2006 minutes:

Page 1 - Location of meeting place – Old Redmond Schoolhouse Community Center

Last Page - Meeting location place and address

Various - Duncanson misspelled as "Dickinson"

Motion to accept and approve minutes as amended by: Margeson

Second by: Stewart

Approved: 7-0

III. Items from the Audience

None.

IV. Additions to the Agenda/Handouts

A. Senior Center Presentation – Teri Burke, Program Coordinator and Linda VanLobenSels, Sr. Center Manager

Burke gave a slide presentation showing the wide variety of activities offered at the Senior Center. VanLobenSels handed out other informational materials. Burke noted that on any given day the Center accommodates approximately 125-200 seniors. Burke added that during a period of one month, 80 individuals who volunteer, total up to approximately 1,200 volunteer hours.

V. OLD BUSINESS

A. Park Bond

Larsen suggested two scenarios to further discuss the Park Bond: 1) set aside time before a regular Board meeting to have a group discussion, 2) appoint a sub-committee of three or four Board members to meet at a time aside from regular Board meetings.

Snodgrass suggested all Board members be involved, holding a separate study session aside from the regularly scheduled Board. Parks staff will follow up.

VI. New Business

A. Grass Lawn Community Park Renovation - Phase III - Don Campbell, Landscape Architect, Bruce Dees & Associates and Wayne Ivary, Wayne Ivary & Associates

Cox gave an initial brief overview of Phases I, II, and III, including improvements made in each phase:

Phase I - soccer field renovation, field turf installation, and improved lighting.

Phase II – Field 1 softball field renovation, field turf installation to extend hours of play, yearly use, field scheduling, diversity of use, improved lighting, tennis courts, landscaping parking lot lighting.

Phase III – northeastern corner of site, removal of existing single-family residence on-site (currently used as a maintenance facility building) and replacing it with a more efficient maintenance facility, addressing drainage issues in play area, renewal of some facilities within area (dated, not meet code), removal of some existing minor trails, add additional parking spaces (10% increase), and meet requirements identified in the City's 2004 Comprehensive Plan, which specified adding additional recreational amenities to the Grass Lawn neighborhood in the way of a gathering place/great public place (indoor/outdoor picnic shelter, courtyard, neighborhood gathering place).

Campbell introduced the conceptual draft plan for the Park. He noted that a steering committee had previously met several times to discuss the conceptual plan that he would be addressing amenities. Some of the issues addressed were: entrance – identifiable entrance off of 148th, two separate structures – gathering place and maintenance building (1,260 square feet, small crew room, storage for park maintenance equipment), community space – placement where existing structure is located. Parking spaces – 10% more, re-stripe aisles, adding 10-15 more spaces, and parallel parking. Entrances – open up corner, improve visibility add sign, better access for buses, one-way in and out. Pavilion – opportunity to bring elements into the park, boulder component, defining passive area and active areas, water feature, slight berming (adjusting existing basketball courts creating buffer),

removing walkway (opening up for tables, chairs), move play structure to other area (adding natural materials for play – small bouldering components for casual non-structured play).

Snodgrass asked for Board comments.

Kelsey – New park amenities will draw more park users – encouraging more use, slightly increasing the parking, current overflow concerns of parking lot on 70th, concerned that 10%-15% more spaces may not accommodate the increase. Some environmental concerns. Kelsey would like to see more dollars spent toward the project rather than add more parking spaces and reduce parking.

Snodgrass – How many parking spaces are there? Byszeski responded that 160 park total and that at a later stage, 10% more parking would be considered in the upper parking lot. Campbell also responded that to create 10% new spaces in the 148th Street lot is achievable within the existing parking footprint.

Margeson – is there a possibility of showing outdoor movies during summer months? Campbell responded that this was one of the activities considered for this facility.

Stewart – Is there a secure “look-through” from the street, for security, into the park with berming and bouldering? She also asked that consideration be made to the geometry and radius of a transit style bus, and overland buses. If possible a little more (2'-3') in radius improvements should be considered. Campbell responded that visibility would be open – smaller berm, no site blocking.

Bourquignon – What is the schedule in terms of next steps and finalizing plan? Campbell responded the next step would be to finalize the site plan concept, size of spaces and structure and cost analysis. Further staff discussion with the Park Board in August, with application for permits in late summer.

Dige – What is the depth of the water feature? Campbell responded that it would be much like the fountain depth at Redmond Town Center. The existing play area will be moved to the more active play area located on the southwest end of the park. Byszeski added that moving the small playground over to the other larger play area footprint would enhance that area, adding the more passive and fun element to the area around the community gathering space, which would add a bouldering element, not currently in any Redmond park. These carefully designed bouldering elements are designed suitable for early age children to teens/adults. Dige has some concerns about 148th and traffic.

Ladd – Are there problems at the park in regards to criminal activity or vandalism and is there a need for design mitigation? Byszeski responded that there had been a reduction in crime and vandalism since improvements made in 2002. He added that the more usage, the less likelihood of vandalism – self policing.

Snodgrass – Are walkways within the park going to be sited so that good visibility is available for bike riders, walkers and other users? Campbell responded that there would be good visibility. She also inquired about lighting on the proposed basketball courts and lawn area. Gibbs responded that this would be evaluated. She inquired if there would be lighting on the lawn areas for outdoor events? Cox responded the “spill” of lighting from the gathering space and sports field would provide some light. Snodgrass – lighting on bouldering elements, too much, too little? As construction takes place, elements for adding lighting may put into place for future addition. Snodgrass – need to balance increasing usage with provision for safety.

Kelsey - more lighting will mean more maintenance costs and operating costs, which should be considered as usage of park increases – balance.

Wayne Ivary – Ivary and Associates

Ivary gave a summation of the proposed buildings and design concept.

Maintenance Facility – located near the northeast corner of park, compact efficient, non-obtrusive building, landscaping and fencing designed to blend into park, service bays, crew space, restrooms, outdoor covered storage area, approximately 1,260 sq. ft., screening wall along fence/gate line with landscaping to trellis and screen building and service yard. The rear of the building is against the northern 1/2 of the existing tennis courts fence, which is higher than building elevation – rockery against fence line, no open space between.

Materials for building – concrete block, stick frame, snap board siding, low slope roofing, sheet rock, colors to blend into landscape and natural setting. Recycled materials have been taken into consideration. May use recycle materials from demolition of existing house.

Community Gathering Space – restrooms, activity area, counter space, fireplace, open indoor/outdoor gathering space, with heaters. Roof line runs from low point to open up into park. Elevation to pavilion, open front glass doors (garage type), expands out to open space and gather space.

Materials – variety of concrete block or some type of cement material (curved, polished, split block), heavy timbers, concrete floors, wood decking and wood framing.

Kelsey – Does not like design concept, straight lines, blank walls, need different type/style building, doesn't fit the park. Likes open to park element, but not overall design.

Margeson – Try to match existing picnic shelter in park. Like idea and concept of opening up building for “see through” and building opening up into park. Would like historical information about the park somewhere inside building.

Stewart – Likes the open concept out to park, angle and direction. Design does not answer question regarding passive activities, et. al, viewing movies in the summer and concern about birds. Ivary responded that an idea might be that the doors in front open and a screen comes down from the ceiling, can also be used for summer concerts; design disallows bird perching.

Bourguignon – Likes angular nature of building, multi-use function, “green wall” concept.

Dige – Likes building design, fireplace, has concerns about glass and back of buildings off 148th in terms of unwanted activity,,

Thomas – Will the building be heated in cooler/colder months.

Ladd – Like timber and glass aspect, would like to see materials that have texture, patterns, more stone like, art deco or art glass.

Snodgrass – Likes bouldering element, like idea of inside screen in exchange for glass doors – allows for viewing movies in inclement weather, does not like design of building – need better alignment on roof, glass fireplace with glass elements, need to look inviting to allow for different usages, parking not too far from building, non-slip/articulated concrete flooring to eliminate accidents, skateboarding and building echo.

Byszeski – building will be open during daylight hours, gathering place, out of elements, management of gathering place concepts to be further discussed, make attractive for small gatherings (Boy Scouts, small group gatherings, neighborhood meetings) size of space is 760 s.f. with a 400 s.f. outside building overhang.

Snodgrass requested that another update be given to the Board at the August meeting addressing budget and lower budget element concepts of the design and revised design concepts.

Gizela Berreth, Redmond resident, inquired about softball field fencing on Field 1, she stated her concern regarding softball hitting distances and danger to park users. Byszeski responded that staff would be installing additional net to add additional height, to the fence, on the tennis court side and around the outfield side of the field to prevent a large majority of high fly softballs. There is currently no fence on Field 3, however, one is planned to be installed to separate the playground and field. Berreth stated she felt that Field 3 might not be necessary and should be turned into an additional playground or cemented bike/pedestrian path. Byszeski responded that during Phase IV planning this may be an issue that citizens would like to address. As funding becomes available the plan for the park will be revisited and concerns will be addressed to change. Byszeski and Snodgrass invited public comment from citizens.

B. Redmond Parks Master Planning Process

Cox reported that staff had developed a list of park properties that had not been master planned. He added that master planning a site opened up opportunities for grants and may identify broader programs that assist in identifying needs in each neighborhood that may be beneficial in a future bond initiative. Some parks were master planned over 25 years ago and need updating.

VII. **Reports**

A. Overlake Planning Charente

Margeson and Stewart attended the two-day Charente on behalf of the Board. Margeson and Stewart attended one day each. Consensus at the two-day event was that the Group Health open space should be kept in to open space and create an International Village type setting, changing 152nd to more of a greenway. The vision is a complete redevelopment of the area with more green space or green way and a more park-like setting. Larsen added that the concept of a public park space and connectiveness to build a community park system, with community gathering spaces and continuing spaces, was part of the design, as part of 152nd and the area at Overlake near the existing Sears store.

Kelsey inquired if discussion had taken place on the connectivity of the Overlake area and downtown Redmond. Stewart responded that there had been in the context of light rail and trail system connections.

As part of the Charente discussion, Margeson suggested a trail from the Overlake area to Idylwood Park on West Lake Sammamish Parkway.

B. Nike Park

Byszeski reported that complaints stemming from poor visibility into the park, due to the natural environment surrounding the site, had been a concern regarding public safety. Staff visited the site, met and addressed maintenance issues as part of the safety issue. Some large bush was removed and native plant material was planted as replacement opening up a large area from the cul-de-sac into the park area providing better visibility into the park. Staff had also met with Police to get some insight on safety issues. Staff also opened up the 92nd Street entrance for a clearer view into the playground area and open space. Staff is working on opening up entrances and sport court area.

Ladd noted that the forested area behind the park was also a problem. Park staff will take a look at the area and see if any corridors can be opened up for better viewing and safety.

VIII. **Coming Attractions**

A. Park Board Tour

Board members agreed that either June 14 or June 21 would work best for an early evening park projects tour. Possible 5:00 p.m. start time. Staff will send out an e-mail to Board members, further information to follow. Larsen would like to take Board members to parks on the east side of the City. Board members are to e-mail with any other projects they would like to visit. Snodgrass suggested that Board members review the list, provided in their packets, of which parks had not been master planned.

B. View Corridor Policy

Cox reported that Dianna Broadie, Planning and Community Development, may attend the July Board meeting to discuss the implementation of the policies related to the Development Guide Amendment, Zoning Code, and language that will affect the implementation of these policies, some of which will affect park resources.

Larsen added that he and staff would like to see the view corridor planning process have a positive outcome; which is the goal of the corridor policy protection - preserving good plans for good parks and meet goals of protection.

IX. **Adjournment**

Motion to adjourn: Margeson
Second by: Ladd
Approved: 7-0

Meeting adjourned at 9:44 p.m.

Redmond Park Board

June 1, 2006

Page 7

By: _____
Lori Snodgrass, Chair

Date _____

Minutes prepared by Recording Secretary, Sharon Sato

Next Regular Meeting

June 1, 2006

7:00 p.m.

City Hall Building - 15670 NE 85th St.

Council Conference Room - 1st Floor